

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/401,740 09/23/99 MALHOTRA

S D/99532

EXAMINER

IM52/0501

JOHN E BECK  
XEROX CORPORATION  
XEROX SQUARE 20A  
ROCHESTER NY 14644

SHOSHIO, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1714

DATE MAILED:

05/01/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

## Advisory Action

Application No.

09/401,740

Applicant,

Malhotra

Examiner

Callie Shosho

Art Unit

1714



– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

THE REPLY FILED Apr 17, 2001 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

### THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 706.07 (f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

4. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_
5. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).
6. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
see attachment
7. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
8. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  
Claim(s) allowed: None  
Claim(s) objected to: None  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-22
9. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ a) ☐ has b) ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.
10. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
11. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1714

**Attachment to Advisory Action**

1. Applicants' arguments as set forth in the response filed 4/17/01 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

(a) With respect to Takazawa et al. as well as Breton et al. in view of Takazawa et al., Ball, or Fujioka et al., Takazawa et al. in view of Ball, and the other combinations of references utilized by the examiner as set forth in paragraphs 4-13 of the office action mailed 3/20/01, applicants argue that the burden of establishing a case of obviousness rests with the examiner and the examiner may not make an assertion, unsupported by facts, of unpatentability and require the applicant to provide evidence to rebut the assertion especially given that the examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

However, it is the examiner's position that a prima facie case of obviousness has been made given that the examiner has provided motivations to combine the references, all the references are from the same general field of endeavor, i.e. inks, or in some instances, the same field of endeavor, i.e. hot melt inks, and that Takazawa et al. or any of the combinations of references utilized by the examiner meet the limitations of the claimed invention. Thus, examiner has properly met the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness and thus "the burden of coming forward with evidence or arguments shifts to the applicant who may submit additional evidence of nonobviousness, such as comparative data showing that the claimed invention possesses improved properties not expected by the prior art". See MPEP 2142.

Art Unit: 1714

Further, with respect to Takazawa et al., it is the examiner's position that this is an especially relevant reference against the present claims given that, in addition to the disclosure of a solid ink comprising polystyrene, dispersant, colorant, and ink vehicle, it is significant to note that col.9, lines 41-48 of Takazawa et al. disclose that the solid ink composition contains plasticizing agents such as dioctyl azelate, dioctyl sebacate, and dioctyl phthalate which are identical to the viscosity adjusting agents disclosed in col.7, lines 7-8 of Takazawa et al., i.e. plasticizing agents clearly function as viscosity adjusting agents, so it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the solid ink of Takazawa et al. do contain aromatic viscosity adjusting agents as presently claimed.

(b) With respect to claim 4 which contains functional language, applicants argue that the courts have held that functional language cannot be ignored, In re Caldwell 39 F.2d 254, 38 USPQ 243 (CCPA 1963) and that there is nothing wrong with attempting to define something by what it does rather than by what it is, In re Swinehart, 439 F.2d 20, 69 USPQ 226 (CCPA 197).

As set forth in MPEP 2173.05(g), in In re Swinehart, the courts held that functional language does not, in and of itself, render a claim improper under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. However, examiner has never stated that the functional language is improper. Further, the examiner never ignored the functional language in the claims.

Rather, with respect to the time necessary for the ink to undergo a change from the solid to the liquid state (claim 4), examiner argued, and maintains, that not only does the ink

Art Unit: 1714

composition of Takazawa et al. possess the same melting temperature as presently claimed, the ink composition of Takazawa et al. comprises the same ingredients as presently claimed, i.e. styrene resin, aromatic viscosity modifier, ink vehicle, colorant. In light of this, and absent evidence to the contrary, it is the examiner's position that the ink composition of Takazawa et al. would require the same time to change from a solid state to a liquid state as presently claimed.

CS

Callie Shosho

4/27/01

*Vasu Jagannathan*  
VASU JAGANNATHAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700